



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/885,485	06/20/2001	Kaushik Ghosh	Juniper-11 (JNP-0105)	4428
26479	7590	04/21/2005	EXAMINER	
STRAUB & POKOTYLO 620 TINTON AVENUE BLDG. B, 2ND FLOOR TINTON FALLS, NJ 07724			BAROT, BHARAT	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2155	

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/885,485

Applicant(s)

GHOSH ET AL.

Examiner

Bharat N Barot

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 December 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 21-24 and 35-40 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 15-17, 19, 20, 25 and 31-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6-14, 18 and 26-30 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

RESPONSE TO ELECTION/RESTRICTION RESPONSE AND AMENDMENT

1. Applicants' Election/Restriction response and amendment filed on December 13, 2004 have been received.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to restriction of the claims 1-40 filed on December 13, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive for restriction of the claims 1-40.

The Restriction Maintained

3. The restriction is respectfully maintained as set forth in the last Office Action mailed on November 08, 2004. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated in the last Office Action is proper, and it would be a serious burden on the Examiner to examine all claims; therefore, the claims 21-24 and 35-40 are withdrawn from consideration.

DETAILED ACTION

4. Claims 1-20 and 25-34 remain for further examination.

Specification

5. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.
6. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract does not contain proper content of an abstract of the disclosure and proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

8. Claims 1-3, 15-17, 19-20, 25, and 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Squire et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,745,243). Squire's patent meets all the limitations for the claims 1-3, 15-17, 19-20, 25, and 31-34 recited in the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 2155

9. As to claim 1, Squire et al teach a method for generating traffic information for analysis (abstract; and figures 5-6), the method comprising: accepting at least one sample (datagram) derived from addressed data (figures 2-3 and 6; column 6 lines 17-41; and column 9 lines 16-30); determining path-centric information based on the accepted at least one sample; and adjusting a traffic metric of a traffic parameter based on the determined path-centric information (figures 4 and 6; column 6 line 42 to column 7 line 8; and column 9 lines 31-57).
10. As to claims 2-3, Squire et al teach that the addressed data is a packet; and the sample includes information from the header of a packet (figures 2-4; and column 5 line 61 to column 6 line 5).
11. As to claim 15, Squire et al teach that the sample includes (parameters) a source address/port, a destination address/port, a protocol, and an interface number (figures 2-4; column 6 lines 17-62).
12. As to claims 16-17, Squire et al teach that the path-centric information determined includes an origin autonomous system, a peer autonomous system, and an autonomous system path (figure 1; and column 4 line 13 to column 5 line 61).
13. As to claim 19, Squire et al teach that the traffic metric adjusted is at least one of a byte count and a packet count (column 5 line 61 to column 6 line 5).

Art Unit: 2155

14. As to claim 20, Squire et al teach that the traffic parameter is selected from a particular pair of source and destination addresses, a particular pair of source and destination ports, and a particular pair of autonomous systems (figures 2-4; column 6 lines 17-62).

15. As to claims 25 and 31, they are also rejected for the same reasons set forth to rejecting claims 1 and 20 above, since claims 25 and 31 are merely an apparatus for the method of operation defined in the method claims 1 and 20.

16. As to claim 32, it is also rejected for the same reasons set forth to rejecting claims 1 and 25 above. Additionally, Squire et al disclose that a data forwarding device comprising: an addressed data forwarding facility for forwarding addressed data based on forwarding information (figures 4-5; and column 6 line 42 to column 8 line 34); and a routing facility for determining and disseminating network state information, and for generating path information based on the network state information (figures 5-6; and column 8 line 52 to column 9 line 57).

17. As to claims 33-34, Squire et al disclose that the routing facility affects an exterior gateway protocol and a border gateway protocol (column 7 lines 18-22 and 38-46).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103(a)

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

19. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Squire et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,745,243) in view of Suzuki et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,771,637).

20. As to claim 4, Squire et al do not teach that the act of determining path-centric information based on the accepted at least one sample includes using at least a part of the at least one sample as a search key to find an item with a closest matching key in a data structure.

Suzuki et al teach the act of determining path-centric information based on the accepted at least one sample includes using at least a part of the at least one sample as a search key to find an item with a closest matching key in a data structure (table) (figures 6 and 8; column 8 lines 45-53; column 10 line 41 to column 11 line 48; and column 16 lines 9-31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Suzuki et al as stated above with the method of Squire et al for generating traffic information for analysis because it would have increased the transmission efficiency and internal processing speed to improved the network latency when a traffic intensity increases.

21. As to claim 5, Suzuki et al teach that the data structure is a searchable data structure in a table form (figures 3-4; and column 8 lines 45-53), and a hash table, a binary search tree, and a trie are well-known in the art at the time the invention was made to use as data structure.

Allowable Subject Matter

22. Claims 6-14, 18, and 26-30 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

23. As to claims 6 and 26, the prior art of record does not teach or suggest or render obvious the act of/means for determining path-centric information based on the accepted at least one sample includes: using at least a part of the at least one sample as a search key to find a first item with a closest matching key in a first data structure; and using at least a part of the first item found as a search key to find a second item with a matching key in a second data structure.

24. As to claims 18 and 30, the prior art of record does not teach or suggest or render obvious the act of/means for adjusting a traffic metric of a traffic parameter based on the determined path-centric information includes: using a part of the determined path-centric information as a key to search items of traffic parameters; and if a traffic parameter with a matching key is found, incrementing the traffic metric of the traffic parameter; and if none of the traffic parameters has a matching key, creating a new item.

Additional Reference

25. The examiner as of general interest cites the following reference.

a. Jorgensen, U.S. Patent No. 6,862,622.

Jorgensen discloses a packet-centric wireless point to multi-point (PTMP) transmission system

Contact Information

26. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bharat Barot whose telephone number is (703) 305-4092. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alam, Hosain, can be reached at (703) 308-6662. A central official fax number is (703) 872-9306.


Art Unit: 2155

Any inquiry of general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Patent Examiner Bharat Barot

Art Unit 2155

April 07, 2005


BHARAT BAROT
PRIMARY EXAMINER